



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/638,102	08/11/2000	David C. Schwartz	960296.97133	7761

26710 7590 06/03/2003

QUARLES & BRADY LLP
411 E. WISCONSIN AVENUE
SUITE 2040
MILWAUKEE, WI 53202-4497

EXAMINER

DAVIS, DEBORAH A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1641

DATE MAILED: 06/03/2003

17

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/638,102

Applicant(s)

SCHWARTZ, DAVID C.

Examiner

Deborah A Davis

Art Unit

1641

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 May 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 and 23-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 14-21 and 23-33 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 8 and 35 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 9-13, 34 and 36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's response to the Office Action mailed April 4, 2003 in Paper No. 14 is acknowledged. Claim 22 is cancelled. Claims 14-21 and 23-33 are drawn to non-elected subject matter. Currently, claims 1-13 and 34-36 are under consideration.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 9, 34 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gross et al (USP# 4,867,946).

Gross et al anticipates the instant claims by teaching a device for evaluating test strips used to screen a variety of different samples. The test strips contain several test sections where the reagents are placed for testing (col. 1, 2nd para and see Figure 2). The device has a platform and a holder to support the test strips (col. 2, see claim 1) in a parallel relationship in which the test strips are perpendicular to the holder (see Figure 2). The test strip has test sections spaced along the strips to allow samples to be deposited (see Figure 2). The limitation "support frame holding the plurality of different

Art Unit: 1641

filaments for mutual exposure to a material to be screened" as recited in claims 1, 34, and 36 will not be given patentable weight because it is intended use. With respect to the recitation of a "semi-custom array for chemical screening" in the preamble has not been given patentable weight because it has been held that a preamble is denied the effect of a limitation where the claim is drawn to a structure and the portion of the claim following the preamble is a self-contained description of the structure not depending for completeness upon the introductory clause. *Kropa v. Robie*, 88 USPQ 478 (CCPA 1951).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims ²~~4~~ and ⁴~~5~~ are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gross et al (USP# 4,867,946) in view of Stuelpnagel et al (USP#6,396,995).

The teachings of Gross et al are set forth above and differ in the instant invention because it does not specifically point out that the organic compounds used are from the groups of oligonucleotides and peptides and that the substrate is of glass fiber.

Stuelpnagel et al teaches an optical imaging system that contains an array of multiple fiber optic bundle strips (see figure in abstract). In the detailed description of the preferred embodiments, a variety of bioactive agents are used in this optical system (col. 12, lines 26-32) such as oligonucleotides, polypeptides, proteins etc. (col. 11 paras. 4 and 5) and substrates, such as glass, are used and well known in the art (col. 8, lines 45-50). A variety of bioactive agents are used to provide a sufficient range of binding to target analytes (col. 12, lines 26-32).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate a variety of bioactive agents of Stuelpnagel et al in the screening device of Gross et al to have a sufficient range of binding to target analytes.

6. Claims 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gross et al in view of Bensten et al (USP#6,372,895).

The teachings of Gross et al are set forth above and differ in the instant invention because it does not teach strips that include a marker selected from the group of printing and fluorescent material nor the use of organic compounds.

However, Bentsen et al teaches in one of his embodiments an apparatus that uses a test strip that contains a printed barcode wherein the printed material on the barcode has an enzyme or spore. The strip is further sterilized and dipped into a buffer solution containing Fluorescence Enzyme Substrate (FES). If enzyme activity is present, the printed pattern will become detectable (col. 20, lines 66-67 and col. 21, 1st para).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have incorporate the printed barcode as taught by Bentsen et al into the strips of Gross et al to detect enzyme activity. With respect to claim 5, "wherein the non-reactive strip is a glass fiber" constitute an obvious variation in design that is routinely modified in the art and which have not been described as critical to the practice of the invention, especially since it has been held that the provision of adjustability, where needed, involves only routine skill in the art. In re Stevens, 101 USPQ 284 (CCPA 1954).

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 8 and 35 are allowed.

8. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The prior art neither teaches nor suggest that filaments or strips in the instant claims include isolating bands of chemically repellant coating between the chemically reactive substances.

9. Claims 8 and 35 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Deborah A Davis whose telephone number is (703) 308-4427. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5 Monday thru Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Long Le can be reached on (703) 305-3399. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-4242 for regular communications and (703) 308-4242 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-

1123.



Deborah A. Davis
CM1, 7D16
May 29, 2003



LONG V. LE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600

05/30/03